

Remarks/Arguments:

Independent claims 25 and 28 are amended.

Claim 25, as previously submitted, required logic to prompt the mobile station to prompt a called party to take the call after a specified period of time. None of the references teach this. Further, the grounds for rejection did not specifically refer to this element in its rejection of claim 25.

Nonetheless, a similar element was addressed in claim 34. In reference to the rejection of claim 34, the official action states that Chow, Khasnabish and Bach disclose all of the elements of claim 34 because Bach “teaches notifying a called party that a calling party has remained on hold (see col. 3, lines 60-64).” Actually, the cited passage teaches something different. Specifically, the cited passage refers to advising the called party for the first time (not reminding) that an urgent call is being terminated to the phone. In the lines preceding the cited passage, Bach teaches a message is played to the calling party to advise the party that the called party does not wish to be disturbed unless the nature of the call is urgent and to instruct the calling party to depress a specified key to cause the phone to ring. Thus, the alert, from the perspective of the called party, is the first alert of a call. The claimed limitation, however, requires that the phone/system provide an alert to remind the called party that the calling party is on hold. Clearly, therefore, such an alert is not a first alert and is a subsequent alert that is produced after a specified period has elapsed to remind the called party to take the call. Thus, claim 34 is believed to be allowable as well as independent claim 25 since none of the cited references teach providing a reminder that a calling party is on hold after a specified amount of time has elapsed. To further clarify this distinction, and not to overcome the cited art, the claim is amended as shown. Further, Chow does not teach, even in his discussion of timers (col. 37/lin. 43-col 39/lin. 65) producing a subsequent alert to remind the called party that a call is on hold.

For these reasons, it is also believed that independent claim 28 is allowable.

With respect to independent claim 32, the official action combines Chow with Khasnabish because Khasnabish teaches “using an IVR for specified messages in call holding features (see col. 6, lines 60-67). First, the applicants dispute that Khasnabish is relevant art that may properly be combined with the reference of Chow to provide missing limitations not

disclosed in Chow. Khasnabish actually is for an apparatus and method for call progress timing measurement in IP telephony and is completely unrelated from subscriber feature related arts. Further, Khasnabish teaches in the cited passage that the IVR is used as a part of call progress detection and may be used as one of a list of events or items that may be used for call progress detection, list including dial tone, busy tone, ring-back tone, DTMF digit tones, periods of silence, answer detection, on-hook detection, interactive voice response start/end, and the like (see col. 1, lines 26-30). It is believed that subsequent references to IVR are in this context. Certainly, Khasnabish does not specifically teach using the IVR to support the subscriber feature of placing a party on hold in a manner that advises the calling party that the called party will be taking the call shortly. In the cited art, the terminating mobile generates such messages. Accordingly, the applicant believes that the rejection to independent claim 32 is also overcome because no reference teaches a mobile station and IVR jointly operating to place a calling party on hold and to advise the calling party that the called party will be taking the call shortly.

Because the applicants believe the independent claims overcome the grounds of rejection for the reasons urged, the remaining grounds of rejection for the dependent claims will not be addressed as they are now moot.

Please direct any questions or comments to the undersigned attorney regarding the Notice of Allowance in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 8, 2005

By:


James A. Harrison, Reg. 40,401
Garlick Harrison & Markison, LLP
P.O. Box 670007
Dallas, Texas 75367
(214) 902-8100/office
(214) 902-8101/facsimile